

Amendment for Final Office Action of September 28, 2010

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 44-47, 49-124, and 127-130 that are pending in the above-identified patent application and stand rejected. Applicant has amended claims 44, 57, 58, 63, 71 and 79 and canceled claim 48 herein. No new matter has been added by the amendments herein. In view of the following discussion, applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

The undersigned thanks the Examiner for the telephonic message of December 27, 2010 wherein the Examiner conveyed that the claim amendments presented herein would not be entered after final rejection.

Ia. Rejection of Claims 44-50, 59, 63, 85, 93, 101, 109 and 117 under 35 U.S.C. §103:

At page 3, numbered part 4 of the subject Final Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 44-50, 59, 63, 85, 93, 101, 109 and 117 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vora et al. (U.S. 5,819,273) (hereinafter referred to as "Vora") in view of Hurst-Hiller et al. (U.S. 2006/0015573) (hereinafter referred to as "Hurst-Hiller"), Christopher Bailey et al. ("Link Augmentation: A Context-Based Approach to Support Adaptive Hypermedia", OHS/SC/AH 2001, LNCS 2266, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany © 2002, pp. 239-251, hereinafter referred to as "Bailey"), Hogan et al. (U.S. 7,299,222, hereinafter referred to as "Hogan") and Meek et al. (U.S. 20050192936). In view of the amendments herein, applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections.

Amended independent claims 44 and 63 of the instant application recite, in part, "a history increase range controlling unit which controls an increase range in the value indicative of the degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated, according to a history on whether or not it is possible for the collection unit to collect the contents to be evaluated."

The cited art does not teach or suggest such claim features.

Vora relates generally to the technique for searching for information stored in information storage devices, and controlling the display of indicia of content for information search on a client computer. The Examiner pointed out that Vora teaches an information search provision apparatus comprising some elements recited in claim 44. Vora merely relates to evaluation of contents only in terms of relevance ranking, rather than reliability. For example, Vora explicitly discloses, "The

Amendment for Final Office Action of September 28, 2010

user can also specify in box 415 the maximum number of returns that the search software is to retrieve and present to the user. This is provided in order to allow the user to view and select the most relevant articles as the searching software ranks the retrieved documents by relevance according to well known document vectors which include parameters such as the number of times a particular desired word (which was included in the search parameters) is used in the document, along with other well known relevance ranking factors." (*See* Vora, Col. 10, lines 55-64).

Hurst-Hiller relates to the technique for monitoring a user's attempt to access a Web site or other network site, and detect failed access attempts such as HTTP 404 messages. The access failure message is not passed directly through to the user. Rather, the user may be given a choice via a dialogue to view a stored version of the site they were attempting to access, so that some or all of the desired information may still be accessed.

On page 7 of the subject Office Action, it is contended that Fig. 3 of Hurst-Hiller discloses a history increase range controlling unit which controls an increase range in the value indicative of the degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated. Applicant respectfully disagrees with such contentions. At the cited portion, Hurst-Hiller discloses automatic redirection to a stored Web image upon access failure wherein a content provider overrides or opts out of stored content redirection. (*See*, Hurst-Hiller et al. paragraph [0009]). The element 102 referred to erroneously by the Examiner as a search history log, is actually a user interface 102, such as an interface included within a Web browser or other application or resource, to perform a variety of networked and other tasks. (*See*, Hurst-Hiller et al. paragraph [0011]).

Hurst-Hiller et al. further discloses that the user may be presented with a set of search results 106 generated via the search service 110, for example a set of Web links or other results or sites which correspond to the user's desired search terms or content. The search results 106 may contain a set of links to a set of Web sites 112 which contain text, images or other content or material corresponding to the user's search terms. Accordingly, the user may access any one or more of the search results 106, for example by highlighting, clicking, or otherwise accessing or activating the links for those results. However, nowhere does Hurst-Hiller et al. disclose or suggest a history increase range controlling unit which controls an increase range in the value indicative of the degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated. For example, nowhere does Hurst-Hiller et al. disclose or suggest further analyzing the error messages to evaluate the

Amendment for Final Office Action of September 28, 2010

reliability of particular web sites.

In contrast, the claimed subject matter provides for a history increase range controlling unit 132 which controls the range of increase in the reliability degree of contents to be evaluated, according to the history of whether it was possible for the collecting unit 128 to collect the contents to be evaluated. For example, if the contents to be evaluated were first collected by the collecting unit 128 after "January 1, 2004," and then the contents to be evaluated were not collected by the collecting unit 128 after "February 1, 2004," and further, the contents to be evaluated were collected by the collecting unit 128 after "March 1, 2004," the history increase range controlling unit 132 controls the range of increase of the reliability degree of the contents to be evaluated on "March 1, 2004" in a manner in which it is set lower than the range of increase of the reliability degree of the contents to be evaluated on "January 1, 2004." (See, applicant's specification as filed paragraph [0048]). Thus the history increase range controlling unit changes the range in the value indicative of the degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated, according to a history on whether or not it is possible for the collection unit to collect the contents to be evaluated. Hurst-Hiller et al. does not teach or suggest such claimed aspects.

Bailey relates generally to link augmentation which is a technique for inserting external links directly into the body of a document. On page 7 of the subject Office Action, it is again contended that Bailey discloses a "value" calculation, which is indicative of a degree of reliability. In accordance with Bailey, the "Page Not Found" category is identified by an SLP, which determines its confidence in the page. However, the confidence is determined by identifying phrases like 'Document Moved', the amount of text in the page, the number of hyperlinks and the frequency of keywords like 'broken', 'error' and '404', rather than storing a plurality of collection histories indicative of whether or not the contents to be evaluated could be collected at different times respectively, and determining the degree of reliability of the contents by the use of the plurality of collection histories. For example, Bailey discloses, "Single Layer Perception" (SLP) network to extract the key features from the page and apply a set of weights to these features. These features include identifying phrases like 'Document Moved', the amount of text in the page, the number of hyperlinks and the frequency of keywords like 'broken', 'error' and '404'. The SLP produces a probability, which determines its confidence in the page belonging to the 'Page Not Found' category. If this is high, the page is ignored; otherwise the context agent applies the

Amendment for Final Office Action of September 28, 2010

TFIDF algorithm to the page and produces a 'context model' for this document." (See Bailey, Page. 246, item 2). Bailey thus parses and analyzes the page to determine the confidence as to whether the page is valid or not. Also, in accordance with Bailey, when accessing the page for the purpose of providing link augmentation into the page, if its confidence is low, the link to the page is simply not added. Moreover, Bailey also fails to disclose changing a range associated with a value indicative of the degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated, according to a history on whether or not it is possible for the collection unit to collect the contents to be evaluated as recited in independent claims 44 and 63.

Hogan relates to a search tool graphical user interface including search results that correspond to the search criteria as well as an indication of availability of content corresponding to the search results, in the form of a graphical icon proximate to the search result for which the indication of availability is being rendered. The Examiner pointed out that "Hogan, though, teaches a presenting unit which presents the value, which is indicative of the degree of reliability of the searched contents, and the search result to a user of the apparatus. (See Hogan Abstract discussing the display of characteristics such as availability or maturity of content and associated search results. See also Fig. 2 #210c "Currently unavailable" and Fig. 2E "Slow load time" Legend showing values indicative of the degree of reliability of search results.)" The slow load time does not directly correspond to the degree of reliability of search results, but may only correspond to the low performance of the Web server, or the narrow bandwidth or temporary congestion of the communication line. However, if the content becomes frequently unavailable, the reliability of the content or Web server is believed to be low. The reliability, in accordance with the claimed subject matter, is evaluated on the basis of whether or not the content becomes frequently unavailable by the use of a plurality of collection histories. In accordance with Hogan, the availability of content is one of the characteristics which are presented with search results corresponding to the content. "Currently unavailable" means only that the content is currently unavailable when providing search results to the user. Thus, in accordance with Hogan, only the latest access is taken into consideration, which would not include information about availability of the content at different timings over a certain time period as recited in the claimed subject matter. Moreover Hogan also fails to teach or suggest changing a range associated with a value indicative of the degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated, according to a history on whether or not

Amendment for Final Office Action of September 28, 2010

it is possible for the collection unit to collect the contents to be evaluated as recited in independent claims 44 and 63.

Meek et al. relates to facilitating predictive web-crawling in a computer environment. The web-crawling ability is enhanced and thus the web page information is maintained in a fresh state using predictive, utility-based, and decision theoretic probability assessments of changes in subsets of web pages. In addition, Meek et al. discloses selective crawling of pages with a high probability of change. (*See*, Meek et al. Abstract). However, nowhere does Meek et al. disclose or suggest determining a value, which is indicative of a degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated, depending on whether or not it is possible for the collection unit to collect the contents to be evaluated. Hence, Meek et al. further fails to teach or suggest changing a range associated with a value indicative of the degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated as recited in independent claims 44 and 63.

In view of at least the foregoing, it can be concluded that a combination of the cited references does not teach or suggest the aforementioned aspects of independent claims 44, 63. Hence, this rejection should be withdrawn with respect to claims 44, 63 and all claims depending therefrom.

Ib. Rejection of Claim 51-53, 60, 86, 94, 102, 110, and 118 under 35 U.S.C. §103:

At numbered part 4 of the subject Final Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 51-53, 60, 86, 94, 102, 110, and 118 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Vora et al.* (U.S. 5,819,273) (hereinafter referred to as “Vora”) in view of *Hurst-Hiller et al.* (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2006/0015573) (hereinafter referred to as “Hurst-Hiller”), *Christopher Bailey et al.* (“Link Augmentation: A Context-Based Approach to Support Adaptive Hypermedia”, OHS/SC/AH 2001, LNCS 2266, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany © 2002, pp. 239-251, hereinafter referred to as “Bailey”), and *Hogan et al.* (U.S. 7,299,222, hereinafter referred to as “Hogan”) and *Meek et al.* (U.S. 20050192936). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested as the cited art does not disclose or suggest all the claimed aspects.

Independent claim 51 recites: “a reliability control unit which determines a value, which is indicative of a degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated according to a result of the determination by the update determining unit; andwherein a plurality of updates on the

Amendment for Final Office Action of September 28, 2010

contents are used to determine the degree of reliability of the contents.” The cited art does not teach or suggest such claim features.

The claimed subject matter generally relates to the use of update information in determining the degree of reliability. On page 11 of the subject Final Office Action, it is conceded that Vora in view of Hurst-Hiller, Bailey and Hogan does not disclose the aforementioned aspects of claim 51. However, it is erroneously contended that Meek et al. discloses the claimed feature wherein a plurality of updates on the contents are used to determine the degree of reliability of the contents. At the cited portion, Meek et al. discloses building a statistical model to predict probabilities associated with web page changes. To build the statistical model, Meek et al. discloses that training data germane to the timing of the web-pages change is collected for a set of pages as well as a specific history of when each page changed. Thus, Meek et al. disclose predicting web-page changes but nowhere does Meek et al. disclose determining the degree of reliability of the contents as recited in independent claim 51.

For example, dependent claim 52 recites that the value indicative of the degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated is increased in a period of time during which it is determined continuously at predetermined timings that the contents to be evaluated are updated. Hence, web-pages which are regularly updated are associated with higher degree of reliability. At page 11 of the subject Final Office Action, this claim is rejected on the basis that Hurst-Hiller et al. discloses such aspects. At the cited portion Hurst-Hiller et al. discloses that the search service maintains data regarding failure rates for referenced Web sites so that the search result rating algorithms used by search services may be trained to adjust the search result ratings for frequently downed sites. However, nowhere does Hurst-Hiller et al. disclose or suggest increasing the value indicative of the degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated when the contents to be evaluated are updated as recited in dependent claim 52.

In view of at least the foregoing, it can be concluded that a combination of the cited references does not teach or suggest the aforementioned aspects of claims 51, 52. Hence, this rejection should be withdrawn with respect to claim 51 and claims 52, 53, 60, 86, 94, 102, 110, 118 depending therefrom.

1c. Rejection of Claims 54-56, 61, 87, 95, 103, 111, and 119 under 35 U.S.C. §103:

Amendment for Final Office Action of September 28, 2010

At numbered part 4 of the subject Final Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 54-56, 61, 87, 95, 103, 111, and 119 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vora et al. (U.S. 5,819,273) (hereinafter referred to as “Vora”) in view of Hurst-Hiller et al. (U.S. No. 2006/0015573) (hereinafter referred to as “Hurst-Hiller”), Christopher Bailey et al. (“Link Augmentation: A Context-Based Approach to Support Adaptive Hypermedia”, OHS/SC/AH 2001, LNCS 2266, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany © 2002, pp. 239-251, hereinafter referred to as “Bailey”), Hogan et al. (U.S. 7,299,222, hereinafter referred to as “Hogan”) and Meek et al. (U.S. 20050192936). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested as the cited art does not disclose or suggest all the claimed aspects.

Amended independent claim 54 recites at least in part: “a contribution storage which stores keywords as elements which contribute to increase in a value, which is indicative of a degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated, and/or keywords as elements which contribute to decrease in the value.... a reliability control unit which increases or decreases the value, which is indicative of the degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated, by referring to the extracted element”. The cited art does not teach or suggest such claim features.

Independent claim 54 relates to the elements contributing to increase or decrease in the degree of reliability. On page 14 of the subject Office Action, it is conceded that Vora in view of Hurst-Hiller, Bailey and Hogan does not disclose the aforementioned aspects of claim 54. However, it is erroneously contended that Meek et al. discloses the aforementioned claimed aspects. At the cited portion, Meek et al. discloses building a statistical model to predict probabilities associated with web page changes. To build the statistical model, Meek et al. discloses that training data germane to the timing of the web-pages change is collected for a set of pages as well as a specific history of when each page changed. Meek et al. discloses collecting information such as number of page-views, the degree of change or extracting features for each page utilizing the contents of the page, the change history for the page, its URL, the HTTP status messages etc. However, nowhere does Meek et al. teach or suggest storing keywords as elements which contribute to increase in a value, which is indicative of a degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated, and/or keywords as elements which contribute to decrease in the value or a reliability control unit which increases or decreases the value, which is indicative of the degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated, by referring to the extracted element as recited in

Amendment for Final Office Action of September 28, 2010

independent claim 54.

In accordance with the amended claim 54, a contribution storage is provided to store keywords as elements which contribute to increase in a value, which is indicative of a degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated, and/or keywords as elements which contribute to decrease in the value. Such features facilitate that the reliability of the contents can be evaluated by selecting such keywords in advance which increases the probability that the contents are reliable. For example, dependent claim 56 recites " a classifying unit which classifies each extracted element into: (i) a first group containing elements that contribute to the increase in the value, which is indicative of the degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated, or (ii) a second group containing elements that contribute to the decrease in the value, which is indicative of the degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated, and wherein when the number of elements in the first group classified by the classifying unit is greater than that in the second group, the reliability control unit increases the value, which is indicative of the degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated." These aspects are not taught or suggested in the cited art. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn with respect to claim 54 and claims 55, 56, 61, 87, 95, 103, 111, and 119 depending therefrom.

Id. Rejection of Claims 57, 58, 62, 88, 96, 104, 112, and 120 and under 35 U.S.C. §103:

At numbered part 4 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 57, 58, 62, 88, 96, 104, 112, and 120 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vora et al. (U.S. 5,819,273) (hereinafter referred to as "Vora") in view of Hurst-Hiller et al. (U.S. No. 2006/0015573) (hereinafter referred to as "Hurst-Hiller"), Christopher Bailey et al. ("Link Augmentation: A Context-Based Approach to Support Adaptive Hypermedia", OHS/SC/AH 2001, LNCS 2266, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany © 2002, pp. 239-251, hereinafter referred to as "Bailey"), Hogan et al. (U.S. 7,299,222, hereinafter referred to as "Hogan") and Meek et al. (U.S. 20050192936). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested as the cited art does not disclose or suggest all aspects recited in the subject claims.

Independent claim 57 recites at least in part: "a contents acquisition unit which acquires contents containing an item to be assessed, the item being associated with a company; a contents specifying unit which specifies own contents provided by the company and serving as an

Amendment for Final Office Action of September 28, 2010

information source of the item to be assessed from among the contents acquired by the contents acquisition unit; a consistency determining unit which determines consistency of the item to be assessed in between the specified own contents and the acquired contents, other than the own contents; and a reliability control unit which increases or decreases a value indicative of a degree of reliability of the own contents, and a value indicative of a degree of reliability of the other contents, according to the decision made by the consistency determining unit⁶. The cited art does not teach or suggest such claim features.

On page 16 of the subject Final Office Action, the Examiner erroneously contends that Vora discloses the aforementioned claimed aspects. At the cited portion, Vora discloses an icon 431 which facilitates selection of available information sources wherein the client system 33 retrieves the list of such sources from the local storage device which contains a list of the available information sources in the network (which may include externally remote sources such as those stored on the Internet server 63). Hence, the Examiner's contention that the GUI button 431 facilitates specifying own contents provided by the company and serving as an information source of the item to be assessed wherein the item is associated with the company is erroneous. (*See, Vora et al. col. 9 line 57 to col. 10 line 3*).

Furthermore, at page 17 it is contended that Hogan discloses a consistency determining unit as recited in independent claim 57. At the cited portion, Hogan discloses determining whether content in a particular web page is refreshed over the last 48 hours. In contrast, the consistency determining unit as recited in independent claim 57 determines consistency of the item to be assessed in between the specified own contents and the acquired contents thereby providing better information regarding the reliability of the item being assessed.

For example, when any type of event is publicized, the event information would be posted not only in the contents to be evaluated, run by the organizers themselves, but also be posted in contents other than the contents to be evaluated that is not run by the organizer. Examples of information sources to be posted in contents other than the contents to be evaluated include the contents to be evaluated when bypassing a network 12, a press conference, and an independent report, etc., when the network 12 is not bypassed. Herein, in spite of the fact that an event information is not posted in the contents to be evaluated, when the event information is posted in contents other than the contents to be evaluated, or when the event information has been posted in

Amendment for Final Office Action of September 28, 2010

contents other than the contents to be evaluated prior to posting in the contents to be evaluated, it is determined that the contents to be evaluated is not appropriately updated. Thus, by comparing the publication circumstance of decision items in the contents to be evaluated with the publication circumstance of decision items in the compared contents, it is determined whether the contents to be evaluated are properly assessed. Hence, the value associated with the degree of reliability is appropriately changed. (*See*, for example, paragraphs [0153-0154] of applicant's specification as filed). None of the cited art discloses such aspects.

Furthermore, at page 17 of the subject Final Office Action, the Examiner contends that Bailey discloses calculation of two values one of which is indicative of reliability of own contents and the other of which is indicative of reliability of the other contents. However, for both the values the Examiner shows the same calculation of a probability value indicative of whether a page belongs to the "Page Not Found" category wherein the "Page Not Found" is the text associated with the HTTP 404 error message. In contrast the claimed subject matter recites that the reliability control unit adjusts two values wherein one value is associated with contents acquired by the content acquisition unit and containing an item to be assessed, the item being associated with a company and another value associated with their own contents provided by the company and serving as an information source of the item to be assessed. None of the cited art discloses such aspects.

Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn with respect to claim 57 and all claims depending therefrom.

Ie. Rejection of Claims 64-67, 68-70, 89, 97, 105, 113, and 121 under 35 U.S.C. §103:

At numbered part 4 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 64-67, 68-70, 89, 97, 105, 113, and 121 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vora et al. (U.S. 5,819,273) (hereinafter referred to as "Vora") in view of Hurst-Hiller et al. (U.S. No. 2006/0015573) (hereinafter referred to as "Hurst-Hiller"), Christopher Bailey et al. ("Link Augmentation: A Context-Based Approach to Support Adaptive Hypermedia", OHS/SC/AH 2001, LNCS 2266, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany © 2002, pp. 239-251, hereinafter referred to as "Bailey"), Hogan et al. (U.S. 7,299,222, hereinafter referred to as "Hogan") and Meek et al. (U.S. 20050192936). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested as the cited art does not

Amendment for Final Office Action of September 28, 2010

disclose or suggest all the claimed aspects.

Independent claims 64 and 68 recite at least in part: "a terminal apparatus which accesses the contents to be evaluated, via a network wherein the terminal apparatus includes an information transmitting unit which transmits client information indicative of the status of access to the contents from the terminal apparatus; an information receiver which receives directly or indirectly client information indicative of status of access to the contents and access history transmitted from the terminal apparatus that has accessed via the network the contents to be evaluated; a reliability varying unit which increases or decreases a value, which is indicative of a degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated, based on the client information; a reliability control unit which increases or decreases a value, which is indicative of a degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated, according to a result obtained from the identity determining unit." The cited art fails to teach or suggest such claim features.

On page 21 it is contended that Vora discloses the aforementioned claim features. In particular, it is contended that Vora discloses an apparatus that "receives directly or indirectly client information indicative of status of access to the contents and access history transmitted from the terminal apparatus". Vora relates generally to the technique for searching for information stored in information storage devices, and controlling the display of indicia of content for information search on a client computer. At the cited portion, Vora discloses scheduling search requests and storing updated search reports 211 which are generated as a result of performing scheduled searches at scheduled times. These updated search reports will be accessed by client systems through the network in order to display in summary format the results of a scheduled search. Thus, the method of Vora is opposite to the procedure occurring in accordance with the claimed subject matter which recites that "the terminal apparatus includes an information transmitting unit which transmits client information indicative of the status of access to the contents from the terminal apparatus". Hurst-Hiller, Bailey, Hogan and Meek et al. fail to make up for the aforementioned deficiency of Vora as they fail to teach or suggest the aforementioned aspects of the subject claims.

In accordance with the claimed subject matter, the weight a client/user associates with particular content is reflected by the information including the status of access and access history. This facilitates in better judging the reliability of contents as further discussed in claims 64 and

Amendment for Final Office Action of September 28, 2010

68. As the cited art fails to disclose such aspects, this rejection should be withdrawn with respect to claims 64, 68 and all claims depending therefrom.

If. Rejection of Claims 78-80, 90, 98, 106, 114 and 122 under 35 U.S.C. §103:

At numbered part 4 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 78-80, 90, 98, 106, 114 and 122 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vora et al. (U.S. 5,819,273) (hereinafter referred to as “Vora”) in view of Hurst-Hiller et al. (U.S. No. 2006/0015573) (hereinafter referred to as “Hurst-Hiller”), Christopher Bailey et al. (“Link Augmentation: A Context-Based Approach to Support Adaptive Hypermedia”, OHS/SC/AH 2001, LNCS 2266, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany © 2002, pp. 239-251, hereinafter referred to as “Bailey”), and Hogan et al. (U.S. 7,299,222, hereinafter referred to as “Hogan”) and Meek et al. (U.S. 20050192936). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested as the cited art does not disclose or suggest all the claimed aspects.

Independent claim 78 recites at least in part: “a decision item predetermined for the purpose of evaluating a reliability of the contents is contained in the contents to be evaluated and the other contents;.....an update determining unit which determines an update on the decision item in the other contents, and determines if the contents to be evaluated is updated in correspondence with the update on the decision item in the other contents; and a reliability control unit which increases or decreases a value, which is indicative of a degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated, according to a result obtained from the update determining unit”. The cited art does not teach or suggest such claim aspects.

On page 31 it is conceded that Vora in view of Hurst-Hiller and Bailey does not disclose the aforementioned aspects of claim 78. However, it is also contended that Meek et al. discloses the claimed decision item. Applicant respectfully disagrees with such contentions. At the cited portion, Meek et al. discloses collecting training data germane to web-pages such as number of page views, the degree of change etc. for a set of pages as well as specific history of when each page changed. However, it does not teach or suggest a decision item predetermined for the purpose of evaluating a reliability of the contents is contained in the contents to be evaluated and the other contents. For example, in accordance with the claimed subject matter, with regard to decision items related to a provider of contents to be evaluated, the publication circumstances of

Amendment for Final Office Action of September 28, 2010

the contents to be evaluated and of compared contents respectively are acquired, and by comparing the publication circumstance of decision items in the contents to be evaluated with the publication circumstance of decision items in the compared contents, it is determined whether the contents to be evaluated are properly assessed. (*See*, applicant's specification as filed paragraph [0153]).

As further recited by dependent claim 79, " when the decision item has not been posted in the contents to be evaluated upon the publication of the decision item in the comparing contents, the update determining unit determines that the contents to be evaluated is not properly updated."

The cited art fails to disclose such aspects. At page 31 of the subject Final Office Action, the Examiner contends that Hogan discloses the aforementioned aspects at Fig. 2A element 205c. At the cited portion, Hogan discloses that a particular web-page is currently unavailable. However, it does not disclose or suggest that the decision item has been published in the comparing contents or that the decision item has not been posted in the contents to be evaluated. For example, nowhere does Hogan disclose what the comparing contents which initially publish the decision item are.

In contrast, an embodiment of the claimed subject matter relates to, for example, an event information that would be posted not only in the contents to be evaluated, run by the organizers themselves, but also be posted in contents other than the contents to be evaluated that is not run by the organizer. When the event information is posted in contents other than the contents to be evaluated, or when the event information has been posted in contents other than the contents to be evaluated prior to posting in the contents to be evaluated, it is determined that the contents to be evaluated is not appropriately updated. (*See* for example, paragraph [0154] of applicant's specification as filed). None of the cited art discloses such aspects. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn with respect to claim 78 and claims 79 and 80 depending therefrom.

Ig. Rejection of Claims 81, 82, 91, 99, 107, 115, and 123 under 35 U.S.C. §103:

At numbered part 4 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 81, 82, 91, 99, 107, 115, and 123 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Vora et al.* (U.S. 5,819,273) (hereinafter referred to as "Vora") in view of *Hurst-Hiller et al.* (U.S. No. 2006/0015573) (hereinafter referred to as "Hurst-Hiller"), *Christopher Bailey et al.* ("Link Augmentation: A Context-Based Approach to Support Adaptive Hypermedia", OHS/SC/AH 2001,

Amendment for Final Office Action of September 28, 2010

LNCS 2266, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany © 2002, pp. 239-251, hereinafter referred to as “Bailey”), and Hogan et al. (U.S. 7,299,222, hereinafter referred to as “Hogan”) and Meek et al. (U.S. 20050192936). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested as the cited art does not disclose or suggest all the claimed aspects.

Independent claim 81 recites at least in part: “an identity determining unit which determines the identity of the contents, to be evaluated, collected at different timings; and a reliability control unit which increases or decreases a value, which is indicative of a degree of reliability of the contents to be evaluated, according to a result obtained from the identity determining unit; wherein the identity of the contents is determined if the contents to be evaluated, collected at an earlier time, is included as part of the contents to be evaluated, collected at a subsequent time.” The cited art does not teach or suggest such aspects.

At page 34 of the subject Final Office Action, it is conceded that Vora in view of Hurst-Hiller, Bailey and Hogan does not disclose the aforementioned aspects of claim 81. However, it is also contended that, Meek et al. discloses an identity determination unit as recited in claim 81. At the cited portion, Meek et al. discloses collecting training data germane to web-pages such as number of page views, the degree of change etc. for a set of pages as well as specific history of when each page changed. However, it does not teach or suggest an identity determination unit as recited in the subject claims. For example, a prediction of probability of when a web-page may change does not necessarily disclose an identity determining unit as recited in independent claim 81. In accordance with the claimed subject matter the identity of the contents to be evaluated, collected at different timings is determined, and the reliability degree of the contents to be evaluated is increased or decreased, according to the determination. The identity determining unit 700 determines the identity of the contents to be evaluated, collected at different timings. More specifically, when determining the identity of the contents to be evaluated, the contents to be evaluated would be newly collected by a collecting unit 128. The identity determining unit 700 determines whether the identity of the contents to be evaluated is maintained, by comparing the contents to be evaluated, collected in the past and stored in a Contents column 306 in search information storage 180, with the contents to be evaluated, newly collected. (See applicant's Fig. 33 and paragraphs [0177-0178] of applicant's specification as filed). None of the cited art discloses such aspects. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn with respect to

Amendment for Final Office Action of September 28, 2010

claim 81 and all claims depending therefrom.

Ih. Rejection of Claims 83, 84, 92, 100, 108, 116 and 124 under 35 U.S.C. §103:

At numbered part 4 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 83, 84, 92, 100, 108, 116 and 124 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vora et al. (U.S. 5,819,273) (hereinafter referred to as “Vora”) in view of Hurst-Hiller et al. (U.S. No. 2006/0015573) (hereinafter referred to as “Hurst-Hiller”), Christopher Bailey et al. (“Link Augmentation: A Context-Based Approach to Support Adaptive Hypermedia”, OHS/SC/AH 2001, LNCS 2266, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany © 2002, pp. 239-251, hereinafter referred to as “Bailey”), Hogan et al. (U.S. 7,299,222, hereinafter referred to as “Hogan”) and Meek et al. (U.S. 20050192936). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested as the cited art does not disclose or suggest all the claimed aspects.

In particular, claim 83 recites in part: a contents comparison storage which stores contents for comparison; a uniqueness determining unit which compares the contents to be evaluated with the comparing contents which had already been collected and stored in the contents comparison storage at the time of collection of the contents to be evaluated and determines uniqueness of the contents to be evaluated if the contents comparison storage does not store the contents to be evaluated. The cited art does not teach or suggest such aspects.

At page 37 of the subject Final Office Action, it is conceded that Vora in view of Hurst-Hiller, and Bailey does not disclose the aforementioned aspects of claim 83. However, it is also contended that, Hogan discloses a uniqueness determining unit as recited in claim 83. At the cited portion Hogan discloses a message on a web page indicating that the search results have been refreshed in the past 48 hours. This is not the same as the uniqueness determining unit as recited in claim 83.

In accordance with the claimed subject matter, the uniqueness determining unit 810 determines the uniqueness of the contents to be evaluated, by comparing the contents to be evaluated with the compared contents that had already been collected at the time when the contents to be evaluated was collected. The uniqueness determining unit 810 examines whether the contents to be evaluated has already been registered, by referring to the contents comparison storage 802. If the contents to be evaluated have not been registered in the contents comparison

Amendment for Final Office Action of September 28, 2010

storage 802, it is determined that the contents to be evaluated are highly unique. The reliability controlling unit 130 increases the reliability degree of the contents to be evaluated, when the uniqueness determining unit 810 determines that the uniqueness of the contents to be evaluated is high. (See, applicant's Fig. 35 and related description at paragraphs [0182-0181] of applicant's specification as filed).

None of the cited art discloses such aspects. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn with respect to claim 83 and claims 84, 92, 100, 108, 116 and 124 depending therefrom.

II. Rejection of Claims 71-77 under 35 U.S.C. §103:

At numbered part 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 71-77 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vora in view of Hurst-Hiller, Bailey and Kremen (US 20060053076) and Calbucci et al. (U.S. 20050131872). In view of the above, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's §103 rejections be withdrawn.

Independent claim 71 recites at least in part, "an asset value varying unit which calculates and updates an asset value for the contents to be evaluated, based on the client information, and the history of purchasing the product through the contents, wherein the asset value is calculated and updated in terms of the estimated future contribution to the sales of the product as a function for a profit over a specific period, customer frequency of use during a specific period, and/or estimated profit." Independent claim 75 recites similar features.

At page 45 of the subject Final Office Action, the Examiner contends that Bailey et al. disclose an asset value as recited in the subject claims. At the cited portion Bailey et al. discloses calculation of a probability value indicative of whether a page belongs to the "Page Not Found" category. In contrast, independent claims 71, 75 recite that the asset value is calculated in terms of an estimated future contribution to a sales of the product as a function for a profit over a specific period, customer frequency of use during a specific period, and/or estimated profit. Nowhere does Bailey et al. disclose that the probability value for the likelihood of the page belonging to the "Page Not Found" category is calculated in terms of an estimated future contribution to a sales of the product as a function for a profit over a specific period, customer frequency of use during a specific period, and/or estimated profit. From the foregoing, it is clear that Bailey et al. does not disclose or suggest an asset value as recited in the subject claims.

Amendment for Final Office Action of September 28, 2010

Furthermore, on page 46 of the subject Final Office Action, it is it is conceded that Vora in view of Hurst-Hiller, and Bailey does not disclose the aforementioned aspects of claim 71. However, it is also contended that, Kremen discloses the aforementioned features of the independent claims 71, 75. In particular, Kremen relates to the monetization and/or distribution of eclassifieds. In particular, the Examiner pointed out that "Kremen, though, discloses wherein the asset value is calculated as a function for a profit over a specific period, customer of use during a specific period, and/or estimated profit." At the cited portion, Kremen discloses displaying listings that generate the most profit for the affiliate site most prominently based on, for example, revenue sharing arrangements between the partner sites. Thus, Kremen discloses taking into account only current profit for the affiliate. Kremen neither discloses nor suggests the feature that the asset value of the contents to be evaluated is updated in terms of the estimated future contribution to the sales of the product associated with the contents on the basis of the client information, and the history of purchasing the product through the contents as recited in independent claim 71 and 75.

Further, at page 51 of the subject Final Office Action, it is contended that Calbucci et al. discloses an asset value varying unit which calculates and updates an asset value for the contents to be evaluated, based on the history of purchasing the product through the contents. Applicant respectfully disagrees with such contentions. At the cited portion Calbucci et al. discloses executing a query on a plurality of data sources which may include remotely located data sources having specialized data, such as, data relating to retail sales, travel, entertainment etc. However, Calbucci et al. does not disclose or suggest the feature that the asset value of the contents to be evaluated is updated in terms of the estimated future contribution to the sales of the product associated with the contents on the basis of the history of purchasing the product through the contents as recited in independent claim 71 and 75.

In accordance with one embodiment of the claimed subject matter, when seeking an asset value of contents containing (<http://-1>), if the annual profit is "100 million yen," the regular customer frequency of use is "20," and the total product property evaluation is "6," then it is estimated that the profit will continue for the next "3" years based on the regular customer frequency of use and the total product property evaluation. From this, the asset value of the contents is calculated as "300 million yen." (See applicant's Fig. 27 and related description at

Amendment for Final Office Action of September 28, 2010

paragraph [0209] of US 20070208699 which is a publication of the subject application). In view of at least the foregoing, this rejection should be withdrawn with respect to claims 17, 75 as well as claims 72-74 and 76-77 depending respectively therefrom.

III. Rejection of Claims 127-130 under 35 U.S.C. §103:

At numbered part 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 127-130 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vora in view of Kremen and Calbucci et al. In view of the above, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's §103 rejections be withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 127 recites at least in part, "an asset value calculating unit which calculates a profit or a profit reduction in a transaction related to the contents, and updates an asset value for the contents in terms of the estimated future contribution to the sales of the product by use of the profit or the profit reduction on the basis of the history of purchasing the product through the contents." Independent claim 129 recites similar features.

In accordance with the claimed subject matter the asset value of the contents to be evaluated is updated in terms of the estimated future contribution to the sales of the product associated with the contents by use of the profit or the profit reduction on the basis of the client information, and the history of purchasing the product through the contents. The contents can therefore be properly evaluated as the asset value thereof. As discussed *supra* in connection with claims 71-77, Vora in view of Kremen and Calbucci et al. neither disclose nor suggest such features. Hence, this rejection should be withdrawn with respect to claims 127, 129 and claim 128, 130 depending respectively therefrom.

Amendment for Final Office Action of September 28, 2010

Conclusion:

In view of the foregoing, applicant submits that the instant claims are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is earnestly solicited. In the event there are any fees due and owing in connection with this matter, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 11-0223.

Dated: December 28, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By:/Bhavani S. Rayaprolu/
Bhavani S. Rayaprolu
Registration No.: 56583
GIBSON & DERNIER LLP
900 Route 9 North, Suite 504
Woodbridge, New Jersey 07095
(732) 634-7634
Agent for Applicant